

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-5, 10, 12-15, 17-20 and 22-34 are currently pending in the application. Claims 23-31 have been withdrawn. Claims 1-5, 10, 12-15, 17-20, 22 and 32-34 were rejected in the Office Action mailed June 22, 2010 (hereinafter referred to as "Office Action").

This amendment is being submitted with a petition for a three month extension of time to extend the due date from September 22, 2010 to December 22, 2010. A credit card authorization for the required fees is being submitted herewith. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees, or credit any refunds, to Chalker Flores, LLP's Deposit Account No. 50-4863.

In view of the following remarks and amendments, applicant respectfully requests a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

The Office Action rejected claims 1-5, 10, 12-15, 17-20, 22 and 32-34 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wilkinson, et al. (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0143775) in view of Bly, et al. (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0077944). Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-5, 10, 12-15, 17-20, 22 and 32-34, as amended, are patentable over the cited references for at least the reasons described below.

Claims 1, 12, 20, 32 and 34

Applicant respectfully submits that Wilkinson and Bly, either alone or in combination, do not disclose, teach or suggest a database that contains "two or more records comprising separate records for each physical asset within the infrastructure and each asset related item within the infrastructure, wherein each record has a unique identifier and one or more data fields representing attributes of the physical asset or asset related item within the infrastructure, and all the records are linked in a database structure to represent the physical assets and asset related items (1) in a hierarchical manner in accordance with one or more business rules of the infrastructure that define how the physical assets and asset related items are interconnected in the infrastructure" as recited in claims 1, 12, 20, 32 and 34.

Wilkinson discloses a "database containing a plurality of individual media objects the instantiations of which include video images, still images and text." ([0009], lines 46). "[T]he taxonomy system link[s] categories of media objects in the database in a hierarchical tree system from of nodes with each node representing a category." ([0009], lines 10-13). For example, Figure 7 discloses a tree structure 200 having a parent node 201, child nodes 201-211 and links (212-215). Each node represents a category. (paragraph [0047]). The categories or nodes in Wilkinson are not assigned to represent

physical assets or asset related items within an infrastructure; instead they are assigned to access the media objects in a manner that is easy and convenient for the user. As a result, applicant respectfully submits that Wilkinson manages multi-media assets and does not manage an infrastructure containing physical assets and asset related items wherein separate records are used for each physical asset within the infrastructure and each asset related item within the infrastructure as recited in claims 1, 12, 20, 32 and 34.

Referring to Figure 5 of Wilkinson, the database structure appears to reside in Section B (media objects 100 and resources 115). (paragraph [0036]). The project/workflow view of Section A and the taxonomy view of Section B are created as two separate interfaces to allow users to view and access the database (media objects 100 and resources 115). (paragraphs [0034]-[0035], [0037]-[0038]). Applicant respectfully submits that Wilkinson's taxonomy is not in accordance with one or more business rules of the infrastructure that define how the physical assets and asset related items are interconnected in the infrastructure. Instead, the taxonomy of Wilkinson "enables the user to access the database in a particularly flexible manner." (paragraph [0048]). So, the rules are not based on the infrastructure; they are based how the users "wishes to provide the information to a potential customer." (paragraph [0051]).

Applicant respectfully submits that Bly does not cure the deficiencies of Wilkinson because Bly does not use separate records for each physical asset and each asset related item. As shown in Figures 6 and 9, all the data pertaining to an asset is stored in a single record. Separate records are not used for asset related items.

Finally, the Office Action indicated that "Wilkinson does not expressly disclose that the records in the database are linked to represent assets and asset related items (2) in a life cycle of the asset and asset related items." (page 4, item 8). Applicant agrees. The Office Action indicated that "Bly discloses a physical asset database containing records of assets with attributes such as operating life." (page 4, item 9). Figure 14 and paragraph 176 of Bly merely show storing operating data within the data record for the asset. Applicant respectfully submits that storing information about the life of an asset in the data record for the asset is not the same as linking records in a database to represent a life cycle of the physical asset and asset related item as recited in claims 1, 12, 20, 32 and 34. As a result, Bly does not cure the deficiencies of Wilkinson.

Moreover, applicant respectfully submits that one skilled in the art would not modify the multi-media management system of Wilkinson to link the media objects to represent a life cycle of the media objects. Applicant respectfully submits that media objects do not have an "operating life" as that term is used in Bly with respect to moveable industrial equipment.

For at least the reasons stated above, applicant respectfully submits that Wilkinson and Bly, either alone or in combination, do not disclose, teach or suggest

every element recited in claims 1, 12, 20, 32 and 34. Accordingly, applicant respectfully submits that claims 1, 12, 20, 32 and 34 are not obvious over Wilkinson in view of Bly and are, therefore, allowable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 1, 12, 20, 32 and 34 be withdrawn.

Claims 2-5, 10, 13-15, 17-19, 22 and 33

Applicant respectfully submits that claims 2-5, 10, 13-15, 17-19, 22 and 33 depend from claims 1, 12, 20 and 32 which are allowable for the reasons stated above, and further distinguish over the cited references. Claims 2-5, 10, 13-15, 17-19, 22 and 33 are, therefore, allowable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Accordingly, applicant respectfully requests that any rejection of claims 2-5, 10, 13-15, 17-19, 22 and 33 be withdrawn.

Conclusion

For the reasons set forth above, applicant respectfully requests reconsideration by the examiner and withdrawal of the rejections. Applicant submits that claims 1-5, 10, 12-15, 17-20 and 22-34 as amended, are fully patentable. Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. If the examiner has any questions or comments, or if further clarification is required, it is requested that the examiner contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Date: December 22, 2010

Respectfully submitted,
CHALKER FLORES, LLP

By 

Daniel J. Chalker
Reg. No. 40,552
Tel.: (214) 866-0001
Fax: (214) 866-0010

2711 LBJ Frwy, Suite 1036
Dallas, Texas 75234